



# Hiwassee & Savannah River Basins Ambient Monitoring System Report

January 1, 2005 through December 31, 2009



### TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
INTRODUCTION	5
PARAMETERS	7
Dissolved Oxygen	7
pH	7
Specific Conductance	
Turbidity	
Nutrients	
Fecal Coliform Bacteria	8
Total Metals	
WATER QUALITY MONITORING RESULTS SUMMARY	
Assessment Considerations	
Providing Confidence in the Exceedance of Water Quality Standards	
Methods Used to Summarize Results	
Box and Whisker Plots	
Scatter Plots – Change Over Time and Trends	
Maps	
WATER QUALITY ANALYSIS	15
Stream Flow and Drought	
Long Term Trends	
Geographic Assessment	
Other Issues	

### **Evaluation Levels**

In order to assist the reader in developing a rapid understanding of the summary statistics provided throughout this data review, concentrations of water quality variables may be compared to an Evaluation Level (EL). Evaluation levels may be a water quality standard, an action level, an ecological threshold, or simply an arbitrary threshold that facilitates a rapid data review. Evaluation levels are further examined for frequency to determine if they have been exceeded in more than 10 percent of the observed samples. This summary approach facilitates a rapid and straightforward presentation of the data but may not be appropriate for making specific use support decisions necessary for identification of impaired waters under the Clean Water Act's requirements for 303(d) listings. The reader is advised to review the states 303(d) listing methodology for this purpose. (see http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/wq/ps/mtu/assessment).

### **TABLES**

Table 1. Parametric coverage for the Ambient Monitoring System	5
Table 2. Selected Water Quality Standards	6
Table 3. Monitoring Stations in the Hiwassee & Savannah River Basins	
Table 4. Frequency of Evaluation Level Exceedances	9
Table 5a. Summary of Water Quality Parameter Averages	9
Table 5b. Summary of Water Quality Parameter Averages for Nutrients	9
Table 6. Exceedance Confidence	11
FIGURES	
Figure 1. DWQ's Ambient Monitoring System in the Hiwassee & Savannah River Basins	6
Figure 2. An Example Box Plot for a Station	
Figure 3. Scatter Plot Example, Dissolved Oxygen over Time	
Figure 4. Example Map	
Figure 5. Average Monthly Stream Flow	
Figure 6. Fecal Coliform in the Hiwassee & Savannah River Basins	
Figure 7. Box Plots of Water Quality Parameters in the Savannah River Basin	
Figure 8. Box Plots of Water Quality Parameters in the Savannah River Basin	
Figure 9. Box Plots of Water Quality Parameters in the Hiwassee River Basin	
Figure 10. Box Plots of Water Quality Parameters in the Hiwassee River Basin	
Figure 11. Box Plots of Water Quality Parameters in the Hiwassee River Basin	
Figure 12. Box Plots of Water Quality Parameters in the Hiwassee River Basin	28
APPENDIXES	
Appendix A. AMS Station Summary Sheets	17
Appendix B. Station Box & Whisker Plots	22
Appendix C. References	29

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

A general understanding of human activities and natural forces that affect pollution loads and their potential impacts on water quality can be obtained through routine sampling from fixed water quality monitoring stations. During this assessment period (January 1, 2005 through December 31, 2009) chemical and physical measurements were obtained by the Division of Water Quality (DWQ) from three stations located in the Hiwassee River Basin and one station located in the Savannah River Basin.

DWQ uses a 10% criteria to determine whether a water body is meeting the applicable water quality standards. If more than 10% of the monitoring results violate the standard in question then the water body is not meeting the standard. When more than 10 percent of the results exceeded the evaluation level (10% criteria), a binomial statistical test is employed to determine how much statistical confidence there is that the results statistically exceed the 10% criteria. If at least 95% confidence was found that a 10% exceedance occurred, then that is termed a statistically significant exceedance (SSE).

In the Hiwassee and Savannah River Basins there were two SSEs, both at the same station. F4000000, Valley River at Tomotla had SSEs for fecal coliform and turbidity. After a long period of few exceedances from 1987 through 2001, exceedances for fecal coliform and turbidity began occurring more often in 2002. Possible causes include changes in land use, land cover, the intensity of land use, or the deterioration of vegetative buffers. The fecal coliform geomean for the assessment period was 199 colonies per 100mL.

Fecal coliform problems are screened using annual summaries of Ambient sampling results. If the screening indicates that the station may be in violation of the standard, the standard is assessed using the method required by law. All such class B (primary recreation) waters are assessed, and other waters as resources permit. F4000000 (on class C waters) failed the screening test multiple times during the assessment period but was not assessed for compliance with the standard. Current resource levels cannot accommodate the time-intensive sampling needed to assess the standard at every site that fails a screening test. Many class C waters with fecal problems thus remain unassessed.

The average turbidity for the assessment period at F4000000 was 6.2 NTU. Spikes of higher turbidity, possibly associated with storm events, caused exceedance of the standard. However it is worth noting that turbidity at F4000000 is not appreciably different from that found at other stations in the basin. F4000000 is held to a tighter standard to protect trout waters.

At the other three stations, there were no 10% exceedances of water quality standards or SSEs, except for a single observation of iron. Iron is naturally occurring in North Carolina surface waters.

### INTRODUCTION

The DWQ's Ambient Monitoring System (AMS) is a network of stream, lake, and estuarine stations strategically located for the collection of physical and chemical water quality data. The stations are located at convenient access points (e.g. bridge crossings) that are sampled on a monthly basis. These locations were chosen to characterize the effects of point source dischargers and nonpoint sources such as agriculture, animal operations, and urbanization within watersheds.

The data are used to identify long term trends within watersheds, to develop Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) and to compare measured values with water quality standards to identify possible areas of impairment. Parametric coverage is determined by freshwater or saltwater waterbody classification and corresponding water quality standards. Under this arrangement, core parameters are based on Class C waters with additional parameters added when justified (**Table 1**).

Within this document, an analysis of how monitoring results compare with water quality standards and evaluation levels is presented. An educational and conceptual overview of water quality standards is provided at: <a href="http://www.epa.gov/waterscience/standards">http://www.epa.gov/waterscience/standards</a>. Specific information on North Carolina water quality standards is provided at: <a href="http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/wg/ps/mtu/assessment">http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/wg/ps/mtu/assessment</a>. A summary of selected water quality standards are listed in **Table 2**.

Water quality data in this report are evaluated in five year periods. Some stations have little or no data for several parameters over the period. However, for the purpose of standardization, data summaries for each station are included in this report. DWQ monitored water quality and collected samples at four stations in the subject basins throughout the assessment period. The locations of the sampling sites are illustrated in **Figure 1**, and listed in **Table 3**.

In January 2007 the DWQ began collection of samples from a series of randomly determined sites. A description of the Random Ambient Monitoring System (RAMS) can be found here: <a href="http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/wq/ess/eco/rams">http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/wq/ess/eco/rams</a>. There are currently three RAMS sites in the subject basins scheduled to begin sampling in January 2011. Because the basinwide reports assess in five-year windows and RAMS stations will only have 2 years of data, they are not included in the ambient reports. Once a sufficient number of samples have been collected statewide, RAMS data will be discussed in a separate report.

Table 1. Parametric coverage for the Ambient Monitoring System.

# Parameter Dissolved oxygen (s) pH (s) Specific conductance Temperature (s) Total phosphorus Ammonia as N Total Kjeldahl as N Nitrate+nitrite as N (s) Total suspended solids Turbidity (s) Fecal coliform bacteria (s) Chlorophyll a (s)

Notes:

An 's' indicates the parameter has a numeric standard.

Chlorophyll a and nutrient sampling is only done in areas of concern, such as NSW, estuaries, lakes, and areas with known enrichment issues.

**Table 2. Selected Water Quality Standards** 

	Stan	dards for All	Freshwater	Standa	ards to Support Addition	al Uses
	Aquatic	Human	Water Supply	Trout		Swamp
Parameter	Life	Health	Classifications	Water	HQW	Waters
Chloride (mg/l)	230		250			
Chlorophyll a (ug/L)	40 <sup>2</sup>			15 <sup>2</sup>		
Coliform, total (MFTCC/100 ml) <sup>3</sup>			50 <sup>2</sup> (WS-I only)			
Coliform, fecal (MFFCC/100 ml) <sup>4</sup>		200 <sup>2</sup>				
Dissolved oxygen (mg/L)	4.0 <sup>5,6</sup>			6.0		2, 6
Hardness, total (mg/L)			100			
Nitrate nitrogen (mg/L)			10			
pH (units)	6.0 - 9.0 <sup>2, 6</sup>					2, 6
Solids, total suspended (mg/L)					10 Trout, 20 other <sup>7</sup>	
Turbidity (NTU)	50, 25 <sup>2</sup>			10 <sup>2</sup>		

### Notes:

Standards apply to all classifications. For the protection of water supply and supplemental classifications, standards listed under Standards to Support Additional Uses should be used unless standards for aquatic life or human health are listed and are more stringent. Standards are the same for all water supply classifications (Administrative Code 15A NCAC 2B 0200, eff. August 1, 2005).

Figure 1. DWQ's Ambient Monitoring System in the Hiwassee & Savannah River Basins.






Table 3. Monitoring Stations in the Hiwassee & Savannah River Basins

Station	Location	Stream Class	First Sample	Latitude	Longitude
	Hiwassee River Basin HUC 060	)20002: Hiwass	see River		
F2500000	Hiwassee River at US 64 at Murphy	WS-V	5/14/1968	35.12215	-83.37432
F2700000	Hiwassee River at US 19 BUS at Murphy	С	11/1/2007	35.23490	-83.39579
F4000000	Valley River at US 74/19/129 at Tomotla	C Tr	10/1/1973	35.09422	-83.55992
	Savannah River Basin HUC 03	3060101: Sened	ca River		
H6000000	Horsepasture River at NC 281 near Union	C Tr	5/16/1969	35.32910	-83.80976

Note: Station F2500000 ceased being sampled in October 2007 and was replaced by F2700000.

Primary Water Use Classifications Secondary Water Use Classifications

C: Aquatic Life Sw: Swamp Water
B: Primary Recreation HQW: High Quality Water
WS-I, WS-II, WS-IV, WS-V: Water Supply ORW: Outstanding Resource Water

SA: Saltwater Shellfish Harvesting Tr: Trout Waters
SB: Saltwater Primary Recreation CA, +: Critical Area

SC: Saltwater Aquatic Life NSW: Nutrient Sensitive Waters

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Refer to 2B.0211 for narrative description of limits.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Membrane filter total coliform count per 100 ml of sample.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Membrane filter fecal coliform count per 100 ml of sample.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>An instantaneous reading may be as low as 4.0 mg/L, but the daily average must be 5.0 mg/L or more.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>Designated swamp waters may have a dissolved oxygen less than 5.0 mg/L and a pH as low as 4.3, if due to natural conditions.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>For effluent limits only, refer to 2B.0224(1)(b)(ii).

### **PARAMETERS**

### **Dissolved Oxygen**

Dissolved oxygen is one of the most important of all the chemical measurements. Dissolved oxygen provides valuable information about the ability of the water to support aquatic life and the capacity of water to assimilate point and nonpoint discharges. Water quality standards for dissolved oxygen vary depending on the classification of the body of water. For freshwaters, 15A NCAC 02B .0211 (3)(b) specifies:

Dissolved oxygen: not less than 6.0 mg/l for trout waters; for non-trout waters, not less than a daily average of 5.0 mg/l with a minimum instantaneous value of not less than 4.0 mg/l; swamp waters, lake coves or backwaters, and lake bottom waters may have lower values if caused by natural conditions.

### pН

The pH of natural waters can vary throughout the state. Low values, such as less than 7.0 Standard Units (SU), can be found in waters rich in dissolved organic matter, such as swamp lands. High values, such as greater than 7.0 SU may be found during algal blooms. Point source dischargers can also influence the pH of a stream. The measurement of pH is relatively easy; however the accuracy of field measurements is limited by the abilities of the field equipment, which is generally accurate to within 0.2 SU. This is due, in part, because the scale for measuring pH is logarithmic (i.e. a pH of 8 is ten times less concentrated in hydrogen ions than a pH of 7). The water quality standards for pH in freshwaters consider values less than 6.0 SU or greater than 9.0 SU to warrant attention. In swamp waters, a pH below 4.3 SU is of concern.

### **Specific Conductance**

In this report, conductivity is synonymous with specific conductance. It is reported in micro-mhos per centimeter ( $\mu$ mhos/cm) at 25°C. Conductivity is a measure of the ability of water to conduct an electric current. The presence of ions and temperature are major factors in the ability of water to conduct a current. Clean freshwater has a low conductivity, whereas high conductivities may indicate polluted water or saline conditions. Measurements reported are corrected for temperature, thus the range of values reported over a period of time indicate the relative presence of ions in water. North Carolina freshwater streams have a natural conductance range of 17-65  $\mu$ mhos/cm (USGS 1992).

Conductivity can be used to evaluate variations in dissolved mineral concentrations (ions) among sites with varying degrees of impact resulting from point source discharges. Generally, impacted sites show elevated and widely ranging values for conductivity.

### **Turbidity**

Turbidity data may denote episodic high values on particular dates or within narrow time periods. These can often be the result of intense or sustained rainfall events; however elevated values can occur at other times.

### **Nutrients**

Compounds of nitrogen and phosphorus are major components of living organisms and thus are essential to maintain life. These compounds are collectively referred to as "nutrients." Nitrogen compounds include ammonia-nitrogen (NH<sub>3</sub>-N), total Kjeldahl nitrogen (TKN) and nitrite+nitrate nitrogen (NO<sub>2</sub>+NO<sub>3</sub>-N). Phosphorus is measured as total phosphorus. When nutrients are introduced to an aquatic ecosystem from municipal and industrial treatment processes, or runoff from urban or agricultural land, the excessive growth of algae and other plants may occur (i.e. algal blooms and infestations).

At neutral pH in water, ammonia normally forms an ionized solution of ammonium hydroxide, with only a small amount of ammonia. However, as pH increases, more ammonia is left unionized. Unionized ammonia is toxic to fish and other aquatic organisms.

### **Fecal Coliform Bacteria**

Concentrations of fecal coliform bacteria can vary greatly. The descriptive statistics used to evaluate fecal coliform bacteria data include the geometric mean and the median depending on the classification of the waterbody. For all freshwater sites in the Hiwassee & Savannah River Basins, the standard specified in Administrative Code 15A NCAC 02B.0211 (3)(e) (May 1, 2007) is applicable:

"Organisms of the coliform group: fecal coliforms shall not exceed a geometric mean of 200/100ml (MF count) based upon at least five consecutive samples examined during any 30 day period, nor exceed 400/100ml in more than 20 percent of the samples examined during such period; violations of the fecal coliform standard are expected during rainfall events and, in some cases, this violation is expected to be caused by uncontrollable nonpoint source pollution; all coliform concentrations are to be analyzed using the membrane filter technique unless high turbidity or other adverse conditions necessitate the tube dilution method; in case of controversy over results, the MPN 5-tube dilution technique shall be used as the reference method."

Fecal coliform problems are screened using annual summaries of Ambient sampling results. If the screening indicates that the station may be in violation of the standard, the standard is assessed using the method required by law. All such class B waters are assessed, and other waters as resources permit. The required assessment method is known as "5 in 30", collecting a minimum five samples within a span of 30 days. If a water body exceeds the standard more than 20% of the time during the 30-day period or the geomean for the 30-day period is greater than 200, then that water body is considered impaired and is added to the impaired water list, the 303(d) list.

### **Total Metals**

The North Carolina Division of Water Quality is currently reviewing water quality standards for metals. Review of historical total metals data and biological data has shown that no correlation exists between exceedance of total metals ambient standards and biological impairment. Therefore, as of May 2007 DWQ has suspended collection of total metals at AMS stations. Three of the four stations in the subject basins have total metals results from before the suspension. However, the only metal of concern detected was iron (and that only detected once at a concentration of 1100 ug/L), which naturally occurs in North Carolina surface waters. Because of the likely natural source, these results are not considered in this report. The results are summarized in Appendix A on the Station Summary Sheets.

## WATER QUALITY MONITORING RESULTS SUMMARY

Water Quality within the basin during the evaluation period is summarized in the following tables. **Table 4** shows how often water quality evaluation levels were exceeded. **Table 5** shows average values, for comparison against HUC and basinwide averages.

**Table 4. Frequency of Evaluation Level Exceedances** 

Station ID	Stream Class	(<6 SU) Freshwater	H (>9 SU) Freshwater	Turb (>50 NTU) Freshwater	oidity (>10 NTU) Troutwater	Fecal Coliform (>400 colonies/100 mL) Freshwater						
	ŀ	Hiwassee Rive	r Basin HUC 0	6020002: Hiwa	assee River							
F2500000	WS-V	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	NA	8.0%						
F2700000	С	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	NA	11.5%						
F4000000	C Tr	0.0%	0.0%	NA	17.6%	33.3%						
	Savannah River Basin HUC 03060101: Seneca River											
H6000000	C Tr	9.8%	0.0%	NA	1.9%	3.8%						

NA: This evaluation level is **Not Applicable** for this parameter in this stream class.

If there are no exceedances for a given combination of evaluation level, stream class, and parameter during the assessment period, then that column is not included in the table.

- 1. There were no exceedances for **dissolved oxygen** during the assessment period.
- 2. There were no exceedances for water temperature during the assessment period.
- 3. No samples were collected for **chlorophyll a** during the assessment period.

**Table 5a. Summary of Water Quality Parameter Averages** 

Station	Stream Class	Water Temperature	(C <sub>o</sub> )		D.O. (mg/L)		(NS) Hd	200 C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	(umhos/cm at 25°C)		Turbidity (NTU)	Eecal coliform (#	colonies per 100mL)
		n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean
HUC 0602	0002	100	15.1	90	10.2	94	6.9	96	39	102	6.9	102	91
F2500000	WS-V	24	16.3	22	10.3	23	7.0	22	27	25	6.4	25	74
F2700000	С	26	14.7	23	10.3	25	6.7	26	28	26	8.7	26	24
F4000000	C Tr	50	14.7	45	10.1	46	6.9	48	50	51	6.2	51	199
HUC 0306	0101	52 13.8		50	9.7	51	6.5	51	21	54	2.9	53	15
H6000000	C Tr	52	13.8	50	9.7	51	6.5	51	21	54	2.9	53	15

Note: all means are arithmetic means, except for fecal coliform, which is a geometric mean.

**Table 5b. Summary of Water Quality Parameter Averages for Nutrients** 

Station	Stream Class	Total Inorganic	Nitrogen (mg/L)	Total Organic Nitrogen (mg/L)		NH3 as N (mg/L)		NO2 + NO3 as N (mg/L)		TKN as N (mg/L)		Total Phosphorus (mg/L)	
		n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean
HUC 0602	0002	100	0.23	102	0.20	102	0.02	98	0.21	102	0.22	98	0.04
F2500000	WS-V	24	0.16	25	0.19	25	0.02	23	0.14	25	0.21	23	0.03
F2700000	С	26	0.14	26	0.20	26	0.02	26	0.12	26	0.22	26	0.03
F4000000	C Tr	50	0.31	51	0.20	51	0.02	49	0.29	51	0.22	49	0.05
HUC 0306	0101	52	0.08	52	0.20	52	0.02	52	0.06	52	0.22	52	0.02
H6000000	C Tr	52	0.08	52	0.20	52	0.02	52	0.06	52	0.22	52	0.02

### ASSESSMENT AND INTERPRETATION METHODS

Monitoring and sampling results considered in this report represent samples collected or measurements taken at less than one-meter depth.

Percentile statistics were calculated for most of the data using JMP statistical software (version 8.02; SAS Institute, Cary, NC). Values less than the minimum reporting level (non-detects) were evaluated as equal to the reporting level. Box and whisker plots (constructed using SigmaPlot version 9) and maps are presented for most water quality parameters collected at each monitoring station. Significant trends in water quality parameters (constructed using Microsoft Excel) are illustrated as scatterplots. Significant trends are found by assessing the probability that the linear model explains the data no better than chance. If that chance is 5% or less (an observed significance probability of 0.05 or less) then that is considered evidence of a regression effect in this document. The strength of the regression effect is given as an r<sup>2</sup> value, the portion of the data that is explained by the linear model. There are many other types of modeling (non-linear) that can be used to explore trends, but they were not used in this document.

### **Assessment Considerations**

### **Total Metals**

The North Carolina Division of Water Quality is currently reviewing water quality standards for metals. Review of historical total metals data and biological data has shown that no correlation exists between exceedance of total metals ambient standards and biological impairment. Therefore, as of May 2007 DWQ has suspended collection of total metals at AMS stations. Some stations in the Hiwassee & Savannah River Basins have total metals results from before the suspension. However, the only metal of concern detected was iron, which naturally occurs in North Carolina surface waters. Because of the likely natural source, these results are not considered in this report.

### **Providing Confidence in the Exceedance of Water Quality Standards**

Historically, NC DWQ has used guidance provided by the US EPA for determining when the number of results that exceed a water quality standard indicate potential water quality issues. The US EPA has suggested that management actions be implemented when 10 percent of the results exceeded a water quality standard. This interpretation is the same whether 1 out of 10, or 5 out of 50, or 25 out of 250 results exceed a standard. Evaluating exceedances in this manner is termed the "raw-score" approach. Although this "10 percent exceedance criterion" defines a point where potential water quality issues may be present, it does not consider uncertainty. Some results are subject to chance or other factors such as calibration errors or sample mishandling. Uncertainty levels change with sample size. The smaller the sample size, the greater the uncertainty.

This document uses a nonparametric procedure (Lin *et al.* 2000) to identify when a sufficient number of exceedances have occurred that indicate a true exceedance probability of 10 percent. Calculating the minimum number of exceedances needed for a particular sample size was done using the BINOMDIST function in Microsoft Excel. This statistical function suggests that at least three exceedances need to be observed in a sample of 10 in order to be [about] 95 percent confident that the results statistically exceed the water quality standard more than 10% of the time. For example, there is less statistical confidence associated with a 1 exceedance out of 10 (74 percent) than when there are 3 exceedances out of 10 (99 percent confidence) (**Table 6**).

**Table 6. Exceedance Confidence** 

Number	Number	of Evo	eedance	ie.													
of Samples	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
10	74%	93%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%							
12	66%	89%	97%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%					
14	58%	84%	96%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%			
16	51%	79%	93%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
18	45%	73%	90%	97%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
20	39%	68%	87%	96%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
22	34%	62%	83%	94%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
24	29%	56%	79%	91%	97%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
26	25%	51%	74%	89%	96%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
28	22%	46%	69%	86%	94%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
30	18%	41%	65%	82%	93%	97%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
32	16%	37%	60%	79%	91%	96%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
34	13%	33%	55%	75%	88%	95%	98%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
36	11%	29%	51%	71%	85%	94%	98%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
38	10%	25%	46%	67%	83%	92%	97%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
40	8%	22%	42%	63%	79%	90%	96%	98%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
42	7%	20%	38%	59%	76%	88%	95%	98%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
44	6%	17%	35%	55%	73%	85%	93%	97%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
46	5%	15%	31%	51%	69%	83%	92%	96%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
48	4%	13%	28%	47%	65%	80%	90%	95%	98%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
50	3%	11%	25%	43%	62%	77%	88%	94%	98%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
52	3%	10%	22%	40%	58%	74%	86%	93%	97%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
54	2%	8%	20%	36%	54%	71%	83%	91%	96%	98%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
56	2%	7%	18%	33%	51%	67%	81%	90%	95%	98%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
58	2%	6%	16%	30%	47%	64%	78%	88%	94%	97%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
60	1%	5%	14%	27%	44%	61%	75%	86%	93%	97%	99%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
62	1%	5%	12%	24%	40%	57%	72%	84%	91%	96%	98%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
64	1%	4%	11%	22%	37%	54%	69%	81%	90%	95%	98%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
66	1%	3%	9%	20%	34%	51%	66%	79%	88%	94%	97%	99%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%
68	1%	3%	8%	18%	31%	47%	63%	76%	86%	93%	96%	98%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%
70	1%	2%	7%	16%	29%	44%	60%	74%	84%	91%	96%	98%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%
72	0%	2%	6%	14%	26%	41%	57%	71%	82%	90%	95%	97%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%
74	0%	2%	5%	13%	24%	38%	54%	68%	80%	88%	94%	97%	99%	99%	100%	100%	100%
76	0%	1%	5%	11%	22%	35%	51%	65%	77%	86%	93%	96%	98%	99%	100%	100%	100%
78	0%	1%	4%	10%	20%	33%	48%	62%	75%	85%	91%	95%	98%	99%	100%	100%	100%
80	0%	1%	4%	9%	18%	30%	45%	59%	72%	83%	90%	95%	97%	99%	99%	100%	100%

Note: Bold entries indicate that there is at least 95% confidence that at least 10% of the possible samples exceed the evaluation level.

### **Methods Used to Summarize Results**

Methods used to summarize the results in this report encompass both tabular and graphical formats. Box and whisker plots, scatterplots, and maps were used to depict data for a variety of water quality parameters throughout the basin. For the box plots, stations with fewer then 10 data points for a given parameter were not included. This occasionally occurred when a new station was added, an old station was removed, or a station was moved to a new location in the basin.

Individual station summary sheets provide details on station location, stream classification, along with specifics on what parameters were measured, the number of samples taken (i.e. sample size), the number of results below reporting levels, the number of results exceeding a water quality standard or evaluation level, statistical confidence that 10% of results exceeded the evaluation level, and a general overview of the distribution of the results using percentiles. These station summary sheets provide the greatest details on a station-by-station basis. They are included as **Appendix A** to this report.

The results were depicted in the following ways:

- Comparing stations box plots
- Assessing stations tables
- Illustrating regional variation maps

### **Box and Whisker Plots**

One method of analyzing data in this report is through the use of box and whisker plots. **Figure 2** is an annotated example of a box and whisker plot that illustrates the distribution of the results for a particular parameter at a single site. This box plot contains both the median and mean values. Differences between the median and mean can illustrate the distribution of the results. For example, if the mean is considerably larger then the median, then there are likely a few very high concentrations raising the mean. Another useful measure is to compare the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile against the evaluation level. For most parameters, 10% exceedance of the evaluation levels is considered a violation. Therefore the 90<sup>th</sup> (or 10<sup>th</sup> in the case of minimum evaluation levels) percentile exceeding the evaluation level is an equivalent statement. Box plots for each station are included in **Appendix B**.





Figure 2. An Example Box Plot for a Station

### **Scatter Plots - Change Over Time and Trends**

Constructing trends helps us to answer the question, "Are things getting better or worse?" In this document change over time trends are illustrated in scatterplots. If there is at least 95% confidence that a particular linear trend explains the data better then random chance (Prob > F of 0.05 or less) then that linear trend was included on the graph. Unfortunately clear trends are rare. Confounding effects, such as flow and seasonal change can mimic or obscure a trend. The figure below on the left shows dissolved oxygen data exhibiting a strong seasonal pattern. In order to search for an underlying trend we first need to remove the seasonal component.

Linear regression can remove the seasonal effect by comparing the target parameter to another seasonally variable parameter, (in this case water temperature) and removing the variation that is common to both. Variation due to flow can be removed in the same fashion. The graph on the right shows the same dissolved oxygen data, but with the seasonal component removed. The data is considerably less variable now (as shown in the variance). The new graph still displays a trend, weaker then it was when influenced by water temperature.



### **Maps**

Maps are used to display data for the whole basin at once, so that the relationship of stations to each other can be seen, and regional patterns become clear. The colors signify the degree of water quality exceedance at each location.




Figure 4. Example Map

### WATER QUALITY ANALYSIS

### **Stream Flow and Drought**

The rate at which a volume of water moves through a stream (the flow rate) can have an impact on the measurement of other parameters. In particular, droughts can have major effects on parameters such as dissolved oxygen, turbidity, pH, and others by reducing stream flow. Therefore it is useful to track changes in stream flow over the course of the assessment period, to see when drought or high flow events might be present. In the following graph the average monthly flow (red variable line) is displayed and compared to the average flow for the entire period (green line). The 95% confidence interval for the average (green dotted lines) is also given. For this graph, any period with four or more consecutive months below the 95% confidence interval is considered a drought.

One site was assessed for flow: the Valley River at Tomotla in the Hiwassee River Basin. A drought affected this site in 2006, 2007, and 2008. During those three years 22 out of 36 months (61%) were drought months. Figure 5 displays the average flow at this station.




Figure 5. Average Monthly Stream Flow

**Long Term Trends** 

In order to develop useful long term trends, it is important to remove as many confounding effects as possible. The most common confounding effect is flow rate. Many environmental parameters can be affected by flow rate. If flow is not accounted for, a drought may accidentally be interpreted as a significant historical shift. In addition, some parameters have strong seasonal components that can be removed in order to see an underlying trend.

Water Quality Data collected by DWQ from inception through 2009 were downloaded from the EPA STORET database for one station: F4000000 – Valley River at Tomotla in the Hiwassee River Basin. Flow data from the USGS website were also downloaded. If flow or other confounding trends were found in the data, it was removed using linear regression. Linear regression and best professional judgment was then used to evaluate change over time.

The data were evaluated for the presence of trends for parameters including water temperature, specific conductance, pH, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, fecal coliform, ammonia, nitrates/nitrites, kjeldahl nitrogen, and phosphorus.

### L4700000 - Valley River at US 74/19/129 near Tomotla

Trends were explored for this station from station inception (1973) through 2009. There were no strong linear trends found for this station. However some significant differences were found for fecal coliform. During the 1970's and 80's fecal coliform had a geomean of 334 and 384 colonies per 100 mL, respectively. The 1990's and 2000's were significantly lower, having geomeans of 19 and 120 colonies per 100 mL, respectively. There may be some concern that the rise in fecal coliform from the 1990's to 2000's might lead to a return to the previous high levels.

Since 2002, the Valley River at Tomotla has exceeded the fecal coliform standard at least once every year and averages three and a half exceedances per year. In comparison, over the previous 15 years (1987-2001) there were only six exceedances of the standard total. This rise may indicate a change in land use, land cover, intensity of use, or possibly a deterioration of vegetative buffers in the drainage area.

### **Geographic Assessment**




Figure 6. Fecal Coliform in the Hiwassee & Savannah River Basins

All sites in the Hiwassee & Savannah River Basins had at least one monitoring result for fecal above the standard, but only one site exceeded the evaluation level of 20%.

### **Other Issues**

Turbidity at F4000000 - Valley River at Tomotla

Turbidity follows a similar pattern to fecal coliform at this station, though less strongly. Beginning in 2002 turbidity exceedances have become more frequent, similar to how they were in the 1970's. Its worth noting however that turbidity at F4000000 is not appreciably different from that found at F2500000 or F2700000. Rather, it is held to a tighter standard than the others for the protection of trout waters.

Information on specific parameters and specific stations can be found in **Appendix A** (station summary sheets) and **Appendix B** (box plots). Box plots were constructed for each of the following parameters: water temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH, specific conductance, turbidity, fecal coliform, ammonia, total kjeldahl nitrogen, total nitrates and nitrites, and total phosphorus.

**Appendix A: Station Summary Sheets** 

NCDENR, Division of Water Quality Basinwide Assessment

Location: HORSEPASTURE RIV AT NC 281 NR UNION

Hydrologic Unit Code: 03060101 **Station #:** H6000000 Latitude: 35.09222 **Longitude:** -82.97642 Stream class: C Tr Agency: **NCAMBNT NC stream index:** 4-13-(0.5)

Time period: 01/13/2005 to 12/15/2009

	#	#	Results not meeting EL				Percentiles						
	results	ND	$\mathbf{EL}$	#	<b>%</b>	%Conf	Min	10th	25th	50th	75th	90th	Max
Field													
D.O. (mg/L)	50	0	<6	0	0		7.4	7.7	8.3	9.7	10.7	12.1	13.6
pH (SU)	51	0	<6	5	9.8		5.5	5.9	6.2	6.6	6.8	6.9	7.2
	51	0	>9	0	0		5.5	5.9	6.2	6.6	6.8	6.9	7.2
Spec. conductance (umhos/cm at 25°C)	51	0	N/A				16	17	18	20	23	26	33
Water Temperature (°C)	52	0	>29	0	0		2.5	4.2	9.7	14	19.7	21.2	24.7
Other													
TSS (mg/L)	22	18	N/A				2.5	2.5	2.5	6.2	6.2	6.2	6.8
Turbidity (NTU)	54	3	>10	1	1.9		1	1.1	1.5	1.9	3	5.9	23
Nutrients (mg/L)													
NH3 as N	52	50	N/A				0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.05
NO2 + NO3 as N	52	1	N/A				0.02	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.07	0.1	0.11
TKN as N	52	41	N/A				0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.24	0.5
Total Phosphorus	52	14	N/A				0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.05	0.08
Metals (ug/L)													
Aluminum, total (Al)	9	0	N/A				66	66	85	140	295	780	780
Arsenic, total (As)	9	9	>10	0	0		5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Cadmium, total (Cd)	9	9	>0.4	0	0		1	1	2	2	2	2	2
Chromium, total (Cr)	9	9	>50	0	0		10	10	25	25	25	25	25
Copper, total (Cu)	9	9	>7	0	0		2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Iron, total (Fe)	9	0	>1000	0	0		230	230	250	290	475	820	820
Lead, total (Pb)	9	9	>25	0	0		10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Mercury, total (Hg)	8	8	>0.012	0	0		0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Nickel, total (Ni)	9	9	>88	0	0		10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Zinc, total (Zn)	9	8	>50	0	0		10	10	10	10	10	15	15

### Fecal Coliform Screening(#/100mL)

# results: Geomean **# > 400:** % > 400: %Conf: 53 15.4 2 3.8

<u>Key:</u> # result: number of observations

# ND: number of observations reported to be below detection level (non-detect)

EL: Evaluation Level; applicable numeric or narrative water quality standard or action level

Results not meeting EL: number and percentages of observations not meeting evaluation level

%Conf: States the percent statistical confidence that the actual percentage of exceedances is at least 10% (20% for Fecal Coliform)

Stations with less than 10 results for a given parameter were not evaluated for statistical confidence

NCDENR, Division of Water Quality Basinwide Assessment

**Location:** HIWASSEE RIV AT US 64 AT MURPHY

**Station #:** F2500000 **Hydrologic Unit Code:** 06020002 Latitude: 35.07840 **Longitude:** -84.02600 Stream class: WS-V Agency: **NCAMBNT** NC stream index: 1-(43.7)

Time period: 01/04/2005 to 10/25/2007

	#	#	Results not meeting EL				EL	Percentiles					
	results	ND	EL	#	<b>%</b>	%Conf	Min	10th	25th	50th	75th	90th	Max
Field													
D.O. (mg/L)	22	0	<4	0	0		8.2	8.5	9.2	10.4	11.2	12	12.9
	22	0	<5	0	0		8.2	8.5	9.2	10.4	11.2	12	12.9
pH (SU)	23	0	<6	1	4.3		5.6	6.2	6.4	6.8	7.4	8.2	8.4
	23	0	>9	0	0		5.6	6.2	6.4	6.8	7.4	8.2	8.4
Spec. conductance (umhos/cm at 25°C)	22	0	N/A				16	20	25	26	32	35	36
Water Temperature (°C)	24	0	>29	0	0		7.5	8.9	12.2	15.8	21.8	23.2	25.2
Other													
TSS (mg/L)	12	3	N/A				2.5	2.5	2.8	5.2	7.7	8.9	9.2
Turbidity (NTU)	25	0	>50	0	0		2.5	3	4.1	4.9	7	9.6	27
Nutrients (mg/L)													
NH3 as N	25	24	N/A				0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03
NO2 + NO3 as N	23	0	>10	0	0		0.05	0.05	0.08	0.12	0.19	0.28	0.53
TKN as N	25	20	N/A				0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.26	0.39
Total Phosphorus	23	4	N/A				0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.07	0.11
Metals (ug/L)													
Aluminum, total (Al)	10	0	N/A				93	97	130	205	255	372	380
Arsenic, total (As)	10	10	>10	0	0		5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Cadmium, total (Cd)	10	10	>2	0	0		1	1	1.8	2	2	2	2
Chromium, total (Cr)	10	10	>50	0	0		10	10	21	25	25	25	25
Copper, total (Cu)	10	10	>7	0	0		2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Iron, total (Fe)	10	0	>1000	1	10	73.6	180	184	258	350	668	1059	1100
Lead, total (Pb)	10	10	>25	0	0		10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Manganese, total (Mn)	9	0	>200	0	0		20	20	21	31	93	130	130
Mercury, total (Hg)	8	8	>0.012	0	0		0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Nickel, total (Ni)	10	10	>25	0	0		10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Zinc, total (Zn)	10	9	>50	0	0		10	10	10	10	10	15	15

### Fecal Coliform Screening(#/100mL)

# results: Geomean **# > 400:** % > 400: %Conf: 2 8 25 73.9

### Key:

# result: number of observations
# ND: number of observations reported to be below detection level (non-detect)

EL: Evaluation Level; applicable numeric or narrative water quality standard or action level

Results not meeting EL: number and percentages of observations not meeting evaluation level

%Conf: States the percent statistical confidence that the actual percentage of exceedances is at least 10% (20% for Fecal Coliform)

Stations with less than 10 results for a given parameter were not evaluated for statistical confidence

NCDENR, Division of Water Quality Basinwide Assessment

**Location:** HIWASSEE RIV AT US 19 BUS AT MURPHY

Station #: F2700000 Hydrologic Unit Code: 06020002

Latitude:35.08530Longitude:-84.03690Stream class:CAgency:NCAMBNTNC stream index:1-(50)

**Time period:** 11/27/2007 to 12/08/2009

	#	#		Result	s no	t meeting	EL		Pe	ercenti	les		
	results	ND	$\mathbf{EL}$	#	<b>%</b>	%Conf	Min	10th	25th	<b>50th</b>	75th	90th	Max
Field													
D.O. (mg/L)	23	0	<4	0	0		7.8	8.2	9.2	10	11.4	12.8	13.1
	23	0	<5	0	0		7.8	8.2	9.2	10	11.4	12.8	13.1
pH (SU)	25	0	<6	2	8		5.6	5.9	6.3	6.5	7.1	8	8.3
	25	0	>9	0	0		5.6	5.9	6.3	6.5	7.1	8	8.3
Spec. conductance (umhos/cm at 25°C)	26	0	N/A				23	24	27	28	31	31	35
Water Temperature (°C)	26	0	>29	0	0		4.3	6.4	9.9	14.9	19.7	24.9	26.3
Other													
TSS (mg/L)	8	7	N/A				6.2	6.2	6.2	6.2	6.2	7.5	7.5
Turbidity (NTU)	26	1	>50	0	0		1	1.9	2.1	3.5	9.9	27.6	50
Nutrients (mg/L)													
NH3 as N	26	23	N/A				0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04
NO2 + NO3 as N	26	0	N/A				0.04	0.04	0.07	0.1	0.13	0.19	0.48
TKN as N	26	19	N/A				0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.23	0.29	0.44
Total Phosphorus	26	10	N/A				0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.05	0.1

### Fecal Coliform Screening(#/100mL)

# results: Geomean #>400: %>400: %Conf:

### Key:

# result: number of observations

# ND: number of observations reported to be below detection level (non-detect)

EL: Evaluation Level; applicable numeric or narrative water quality standard or action level Results not meeting EL: number and percentages of observations not meeting evaluation level

%Conf: States the percent statistical confidence that the actual percentage of exceedances is at least 10% (20% for Fecal Coliform)

Stations with less than 10 results for a given parameter were not evaluated for statistical confidence

NCDENR, Division of Water Quality Basinwide Assessment

Location: VALLEY RIV AT US 74 AND 19 AND 129 AT TOMOTLA

Station #:F4000000Hydrologic Unit Code:06020002Latitude:35.13728Longitude:-83.97960Stream class:C TrAgency:NCAMBNTNC stream index:1-52

**Time period:** 01/04/2005 to 12/08/2009

	#	#		Resul	ts not	t meeting	EL		Pe				
	results	ND	$\mathbf{EL}$	#	<b>%</b>	%Conf	Min	10th	25th	50th	75th	90th	Max
Field													
D.O. (mg/L)	45	0	<6	0	0		7.6	8.1	8.8	10	11.3	12	13.7
pH (SU)	46	0	<6	0	0		6	6.3	6.7	7	7.2	7.3	8.2
	46	0	>9	0	0		6	6.3	6.7	7	7.2	7.3	8.2
Spec. conductance (umhos/cm at 25°C)	48	0	N/A				25	34	40	46	64	71	81
Water Temperature (°C)	50	0	>29	0	0		4.2	7.4	10.1	13.9	20.4	23.9	25.1
Other													
TSS (mg/L)	20	13	N/A				2.5	2.5	4.8	6.2	7.2	12	41
Turbidity (NTU)	51	1	>10	9	17.6	97.2	1	1.3	2	3.9	8.2	15.8	30
Nutrients (mg/L)													
NH3 as N	51	44	N/A				0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04
NO2 + NO3 as N	49	0	N/A				0.11	0.21	0.24	0.3	0.33	0.36	0.4
TKN as N	51	31	N/A				0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.24	0.32	0.36
Total Phosphorus	49	3	N/A				0.02	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.07	0.1
Metals (ug/L)													
Aluminum, total (Al)	10	1	N/A				50	51	70	180	272	571	590
Arsenic, total (As)	10	10	>10	0	0		5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Cadmium, total (Cd)	10	10	>0.4	0	0		1	1	1.8	2	2	2	2
Chromium, total (Cr)	10	10	>50	0	0		10	10	21	25	25	25	25
Copper, total (Cu)	10	10	>7	0	0		2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Iron, total (Fe)	10	0	>1000	0	0		130	130	160	280	450	633	640
Lead, total (Pb)	10	10	>25	0	0		10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Mercury, total (Hg)	8	8	>0.012	0	0		0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Nickel, total (Ni)	10	10	>88	0	0		10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Zinc, total (Zn)	10	7	>50	0	0		10	10	10	10	10	12	12

### Fecal Coliform Screening(#/100mL)

#results: Geomean #>400: %>400: %Conf: 51 199.3 17 33.3 99.2

### Key:

# result: number of observations

# ND: number of observations reported to be below detection level (non-detect)

EL: Evaluation Level; applicable numeric or narrative water quality standard or action level

Results not meeting EL: number and percentages of observations not meeting evaluation level

%Conf : States the percent statistical confidence that the actual percentage of exceedances is at least 10% (20% for Fecal Coliform)

Stations with less than 10 results for a given parameter were not evaluated for statistical confidence

Appendix B: Station Box & Whisker Plots

Figure 7. Box Plots of Water Quality Parameters in the Savannah River Basin

H6000000 C Tr - Horsepasture River at NC 281 near Union




Figure 8. Box Plots of Water Quality Parameters in the Savannah River Basin

H6000000 C Tr - Horsepasture River at NC 281 near Union




Figure 9. Box Plots of Water Quality Parameters in the Hiwassee River Basin




Figure 10. Box Plots of Water Quality Parameters in the Hiwassee River Basin




Figure 11. Box Plots of Water Quality Parameters in the Hiwassee River Basin





Figure 12. Box Plots of Water Quality Parameters in the Hiwassee River Basin



**Appendix C: References** 

North Carolina Division of Water Quality, North Carolina Administrative Code Section 15A 2B .0200 (Red Book), May 1, 2007. North Carolina Division of Water Quality, Planning Section Website, 303d and 305b Lists,

http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/wq/ps/mtu/assessment

Pi-Erh Lin, Duane Meeter, and Xu-Feng Niu, <u>A Nonparametric Procedure for Listing and Delisting Impaired Waters Based on Criterion Exceedances</u>, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL., October 2000.

STORET, United States Environmental Protection Agency, <a href="http://www.epa.gov/storet/dbtop.html">http://www.epa.gov/storet/dbtop.html</a>

USGS Daily Surface Water Data, United States Geological Survey, <a href="http://waterdata.usgs.gov/nwis/dv/?referred\_module=sw">http://waterdata.usgs.gov/nwis/dv/?referred\_module=sw</a>